

Office Action concluded that Nagura et al. anticipates Claims 5 and 6. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 5, from which Claim 6 depends, recites a laminated material having first and second layers wherein the second layer has an interior hole such that a region of the first layer aligned with the hole is not laminated to the second layer and is surrounded by laminated regions. As such, in order for a reference to anticipate the subject claims, the reference must disclose that when a first layer is laminated to a second layer, a region of the first layer aligned with the hole of the second layer that is interior of the second layer is not laminated to the second layer and the region is surrounded by laminated regions. The Applicant respectfully submits that Nagura et al. do not disclose a region of the first layer aligned with an interior hole of the second layer, where this region is not laminated to the second layer and is surrounded by laminated regions. In fact, as evidence that Nagura et al. do not disclose such a region, the Applicant directs the Examiner's attention at least to the figures provided in Nagura et al., none of which show any such non-laminated region and in fact each figure clearly shows continuous laminated layers that do not include non-laminated areas, i.e., the laminated layers of Nagura et al. are continuous layers and thus lamination occurs in areas corresponding to regions of alignment of a first layer with an interior hole of the second layer.

The Office Action supports this rejection by relying on a statement that since Nagura et al. disclose that there is a greater tendency of peeling or separating between the layers of the Nagura et al. invention if voids are largely distributed on the surface of the second layer of the invention, it is inherent that the lamination occurs in the areas surrounding the voids in the surface of the polyethylene. However, even assuming this to be an inherency in the Nagura et al. invention, Nagura et al. still fail to teach that a region of a first layer aligned with an interior hole of a second layer is not laminated to the second layer and in fact Nagura et al. clearly teach otherwise, as evidenced at least by the figures of Nagura et al., as describe above. Accordingly, Nagura et al., can not anticipate Claims 5 and 6 because Nagura et al. do not disclose every claim limitation.

The Applicant submits that the rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been adequately addressed in view of the remarks set forth above. The Examiner is thus respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.


**Conclusion**

Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number AERX-070DIV.

Respectfully submitted,  
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: 11/22/02

By:   
Susan Tall  
Registration No. 52,272

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP  
200 Middlefield Road, Suite 200  
Menlo Park, CA 94025  
Telephone: (650) 327-3400  
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231

F:\DOCUMENT\AERX (Aradigm)\070div\Amendment 37 CFR 1.111 in resp. to OA 7.24.02.doc